



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,912	02/03/2004	Gaurav Aggarwal	14101US03	1702
23446 7590 06/02/2008 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT				
ART UNIT 2621		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 06/02/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/770,912

Applicant(s)

AGGARWAL ET AL.

Examiner

Andy S. Rao

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 (amended) and 7-12 (newly added) as filed in 1/31/08 have been considered but are not persuasive.
2. The Applicant presents one argument contending the Examiner's rejection of previously presented claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nallur et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Nallur"), as was set forth in the office Action of 11/01/07. However, after a careful consideration of the argument presented, and further scrutiny of the applied Nallur reference, the Examiner must respectfully disagree, and maintain the applicability the Nallur reference against as the basis of the grounds of rejection for the reason that follow.

After summarizing the salient features of the amended claims (Amendment of 1/31/08: page 5, lines 3-8), and providing Applicant's interpretation of the applied reference (Amendment of 1/31/08: page 5 lines 9-16), the Applicant argues that the applied reference fails to meet the "...storing a first decoded reference picture from the group of pictures..." limitation (Amendment of 1/31/08: page 5, lines 16-26; page 6, all; page 7, lines 1-18), as in the claim. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is duly noted that the media engine responsible for all decoding functions in reference (Nallur: column 11, lines 60-67; column 12, lines 1-20), and Nallur discloses storing the output of the media engine processing (Nallur: column 5, lines 5-19). The Examiner notes that such storing would occur in the processing of a non-contiguous picture set (Nallur: column 11, lines 20-41). As such, the Examiner maintains that Nallur still address the "...storing..." limitation.

A detailed rejection follows below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nallur et al., (hereinafter referred to as “Nallur”).

Nallur discloses a method for rewinding a group of pictures (Nallur: figures 3-6), said method comprising: storing a first decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 11, lines 10-20) from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 9, lines 55-65; column 10, lines 1-25); decoding a first one or more pictures from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 12, lines 20-30); displaying

the first one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 7, lines 5-14); storing a second decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 11, lines 10-20) from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 9, lines 55-65; column 10, lines 1-25); decoding a second one or more pictures from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 12, lines 20-30); displaying the second one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 7, lines 5-14); storing a third decoded reference picture (Nallur: column 11, lines 10-20) from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 9, lines 55-65; column 10, lines 1-25); decoding a third one or more pictures (Nallur: column 12, lines 20-30); and displaying the third one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 7, lines 5-14), as in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Nallur discloses wherein the group of pictures comprises a HITS stream (Nallur: column 1, lines 55-65), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 3, Nallur discloses wherein the group of pictures comprises 20 pictures (Nallur: column 7, lines 15-25; column 10, lines 50-67; column 11, lines 1-20), as in the claim.

Nallur discloses a system for rewinding a group of pictures (Nallur: column , said system comprising: one or more image buffers for storing a first, second, and third reference picture from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 9, lines 55-65; column 10, lines 1-25); a decompression engine for decoding a first, second, and third one or more pictures from the group of pictures (Nallur: column 12, lines 20-30); and a display engine for displaying (Nallur: column 10, lines 25-40) the first, second, and third one or more pictures from the group of pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 7, lines 5-25), as in claim 4.

Regarding claim 5, Nallur discloses wherein the group of pictures comprises a HITS stream (Nallur: column 1, lines 55-65).

Regarding claim 6, Nallur discloses wherein the group of pictures comprises 20 pictures (Nallur: column 7, lines 15-25; column 10, lines 50-67; column 11, lines 1-20), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 7 and 10, Nallur discloses storing the first decoded reference picture while displaying the first one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 1 lines 50-60); storing the second decoded reference picture while displaying the second one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 5, lines 10-20); and storing the third decoded reference picture while displaying the third one or more pictures in reverse from play order (Nallur: column 5, lines 10-20), as in the claims.

Regarding claims 8, and 11, Nallur discloses wherein the first decoded reference picture further comprises an entry point picture (Nallur: column 7, lines 20-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 9, Nallur discloses wherein the first one or more pictures are decoded in the forward display order (Nallur: column 1, lines 50-60), as in the claim. The system of claim 7, wherein the first decoded reference picture further comprises an entry point picture.

Regarding claim 12, Nallur discloses wherein the first one or more pictures are decoded in the forward display order (Nallur: column 1, lines 50-60), as in the claim.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (571)-272-7337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andy S. Rao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621

Art Unit: 2621

asr

/Andy S. Rao/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621

May 27, 2008